

Sirs,

I am writing in response to your recent article, 'A World Unto Itself: Human Communication as Active Inference'.

Let me first begin by stating my full agreement with the general thrust of the overall argument; however, there are some specific aspects that I believe have been somewhat neglected in either the examination itself, or at the very least, within the tangible output thereof. If you are willing to read on, I will attempt to best describe my specific concerns, as illustratively as possible.

What this particular paper defines as *cooperative communication* is problematic. The immediate proximate reason for concern is the fact that there was an apparent need to modify 'communication' as being co-operative; this is what I refer to as being immunicative, in that the inclusion of the word 'cooperative' directly implies that 'communication' is not so.

Even in the very narrow view of communication, this is already directly stated within the word of 'communication' itself. It has, historically, been defined thus; and (given the resultant output), clearly understood as such. It is over the past century or so, (very roughly speaking), that we have seen a sharp fall-off in the understanding of the workability of communication, in terms of verifiable functionality.

However, one identifiable forms of immunication is, as the word itself indicates, the lack of $[(I + (II+)) \Rightarrow 'This\ one\ plus\ one\ (or\ more)' \Rightarrow "Co-"]$. We, without realizing it, shift from shared perspective to a singular perspective – communication becomes immunication.

Consider: "Active inference suggests that action-perception cycles operate to minimize uncertainty and optimize an individual's internal model of the world." This describes the system that, as seen, has been used for effective communication, something that has been well understood and utilized in the past, but that has degraded significantly since c. 1890. It can be demonstrated that the understood model of communication has been: (intention)>(tense)<(extension); wherein the tense is the process that both moderates the input and mandates the output – the intention and extension, respectively. Moreover, this was understood to be a single iteration in the communication cycle.

Within the greater cycle, we can see that the cycle, as currently defined – but no longer understood* - is the following progressive sequence:

0th Level: No grasp, no process, no extension. No 'prior beliefs'. (The direct human representative, embodying the physical, emotional, and intellectual manifestation of this level, would be a newly born or nearly dead; it is the uncertain boundary of life and death.)

1st Level: There is process, without intention or extension. An awareness of 'I'. On the civil/social level, this realizes Hobbes definition of a life that is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short". When an adult human operates at this level cognitively, we refer to them as "single- or narrow-minded". This is the mode best suited for individualism, and problems require Doctors of Physics or Physiques, et cetera. At this level, our mathematical understanding can be expressed as $I + I = II$. (This one plus that one is merely two ones in proximity). The 'random'.

2nd Level: The binary; the 'I' is taken as input – (impression, in this case), the output being the expression, with the process at this level being assumed. On the psychological level is the Id. This mode is best suited to socialization, and problems require Doctors of Psychiatry or Sociology, et cetera.

Numerically we process $1 + 1 = 2$; Literally we process $I + I = U$. (I_I ; two joined to gather). This is the understanding of me/you, us/them.

3rd Level: The three-dimensional mode; the ‘ego’ that allows us to take in the Id-level expression, process it, and extend it constructively. Viewed on a literal basis, we can understand $I + I + I = “We”$. It is the mode most effective in direct input-to-output relation, and often informs the national level. The ‘arbitrary’. The level of Capitals, Capitols, and Captains.

4th Level: A framework that manipulates four concepts in conjunction, and the level of ‘ideas’. The process itself is once again assumed, rather than explicit; we could map the iteration at this level as being (intention + impression)><(extension + expression). The Master level in arts, crafts, and academia. The ‘Major’ level, militarily.

5th Level: The civil level, this is a five-dimensional iteration in the cycle, with a fully explicit process, (i.e., open and transparent). It takes in and processes all previous levels, thus producing a theoretically ‘new’ expressive extension – a prescription. This is the Doctoral level, academically. The ‘General Officer’ level, militarily.

As already noted, over the course of slightly more than a century, our overall understanding of this has narrowed, until the binary, exclusionary ‘social’ level has subsumed or assumed the attributes of the other levels, and so increased the ratio of immunication to communication – the ‘noise to signal’ ratio, if you’ll allow a weak metaphor.

This is but a quick gloss, of course, but I will close with an ever quicker gloss of the broadened implications:

Any act performed by a Human Being is thus Human Communication. The building of a University creates, on a previously undifferentiated field (the ‘paper’, or medium), a sharp contrast between that which is meant to contain (the ‘character’) and that which is not (the space). Furthermore, the exact nature of the individual container, while recognizably derived from a set template (such as building codes, tradition, etc.), is varied to accentuate independent perceptions of creator, creation, and consumer alike. This particular form of communication is extremely durable, but possesses low repetition rates, narrowly specific bandwidths, and a high degree of latency – and that only if the audience intends to ‘read’ it.

I hope that the above will aid you in some small way as you continue your examination and exposition of this aspect of human interaction; I look forward with anticipatory delight toward future interactions with this subject.

Sincerely,

Craig Gosse

* Hence, your article, I assume.